

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 10-14 were examined by the Office, and all claims were rejected in the Office Action of October 15, 2009. With this response, claims 1-5 and 11-14 are amended. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

In section 3, on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Miyashita (U.S. Patent No. 6,909,906) in view of Steele (U.S. Patent No. 6,201,534), and in further view of Lee (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2003/0016417). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination, because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, alone or in combination, at least fail to disclose or suggest that the one or more pointing device components are configured to give the already existing electronic communication or player device, in addition to its main functions, an auxiliary function as a pointing device with respect to an external electronic screen display device, thus enabling the already existing electronic communication or player device to act together with the external electronic screen display device, and the external electronic screen display device is other than the screen display of the already existing electronic communication or player device, as recited in claim 1.

The Office acknowledges on page 3 of the Office Action, that Miyashita does not disclose that the already existing electronic communication device or player device acts together with the external electronic screen display device, and relies upon Steele for this teaching. However, applicant respectfully submits that Steele also fails to disclose or suggest that an already existing electronic communication or player device acts together with an external electronic screen display device, where the external electronic screen display device is other than the screen display of the already existing electronic communication or player device, as recited in claim 1. The Office asserts that video

monitor (416a) of Figure 6A corresponds to the external electronic screen display device, as recited in claim 1. However, the video monitor (416a) is part of the remote control system (400a) that includes the electronic controller (414a) and the video monitor (416a). See Steele column 6, lines 41-44. Therefore, the video monitor (416a) of Steele cannot be the external electronic screen display device of claim 1, because it is at most the screen display of the already existing electronic communication or player device, since the remote controller (414a) does not include a display screen of its own. Instead, the display screen for the remote controller (414a) is that of the video monitor (416a). As such, Steele would provide no motivation to provide an already existing electronic communication or player device to act together with an external electronic screen display device that is not a display screen of the already existing electronic communication or player device, since Steele only discloses one screen display. Therefore, the teachings of Steele suffer from the same deficiencies recognized by the Office as Miyashita with respect to the already existing electronic communication or player device acting together with an external electronic screen display device. Accordingly, for at least this reason, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Furthermore, the Office acknowledges on page 4 of the Office Action that Miyashita and Steele do not mention that the pointing device is configured to operate independently of a functionality of the existing electronic communication or player device, and relies upon Lee for this teaching. The Office asserts that the functionality of the laser guiding device is separate from the functionality of the mouse. However, claim 1 requires that the already existing electronic communication or player device has, in addition to its main functions, an auxiliary function as a pointing device with respect to an external electronic screen display device, thus enabling the already existing electronic communication or player device to act together with the external electronic screen display device. Merely because the laser guiding device of Lee may be separate from the functionality of the mouse in Lee does not provide one of skill in the art to modify the cited references to arrive at the limitations recited in claim 1. In particular, the projected laser beam does not enable the wireless transmission unit of Lee to act together with the computer (3) or projector (5). Instead, the laser pointing device merely acts as a pointer

with respect to items on the screen (6). Lee only provides the pointer (61) that acts together with the projection screen (6) of the projector (5) in connection with the computer (3). See Lee paragraph [0028]. For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.


The claims rejected above, and depending from claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all of the claims of the application are now in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12 January 2010



Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676